



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,809	11/17/2003	Krishnan Suresh	KSI-325US	5201
56223	7590	08/30/2006	EXAMINER	
KULICKE AND SOFFA INDUSTRIES, INC. 1005 VIRGINIA DRIVE FORT WASHINGTON, PA 19034				EDMONDSON, LYNNE RENEE
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1725		

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/715,809	SURESH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lynne Edmondson	1725	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2,7-10,12-17,20 and 22-33 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 2,7-10,12-17 and 20 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 22-33 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11/17/03 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/13/06
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 22, 25 and 29 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 12-14 of copending Application No. 11/092399. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both teach wire bonding methods comprising positioning a workpiece on a moving work table, moving a bond head in a horizontal position and moving the workpiece in a second substantially horizontal direction during bonding wherein the bondhead rotates about a vertical axis and workpieces are supplied from a magazine. However the '399 claims do not use the term high speed bonding

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that most modern conventional wire bonding processes are high speed bonding processes and that the '399 process would be applicable in a high speed method.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 22, 23, 25, 26, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miyoshi (USPN 5699951).

Miyoshi teaches a method of wire bonding by positioning a workpiece on a moving work table, moving a bond head in a horizontal position and moving the workpiece in a second substantially horizontal direction during bonding wherein the bondhead rotates about a horizontal axis and workpieces are supplied from a magazine. The bondhead moves in the x and y directions (figures 5, 8, col 4 line 40 – col 6 line 15 and col 10 line 40 – col 11 line 6).

5. Claims 22 and 24-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnson et al. (USPN 6640423 B1).

Johnson teaches a method of wire bonding by positioning a workpiece on a moving work table, moving a bond head in a horizontal position and moving the workpiece in a second substantially horizontal direction during bonding wherein the bondhead rotates about a vertical axis and workpieces are supplied from a magazine. The bondhead moves in the x and y directions (figures 2, 3, 9, col 2 line 50 – col 3 line 52, col 6 line 43 – col 8 line 23, col 8 line 55 – col 9 line 27 and col 10 lines 19-48). Multiple bond heads and supports are employed and the camera is conveyed (col 8 lines 1-23 and col 9 lines 10-27).

6. Claims 22, 25, 26, 28-30, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ohkubo et al. (US 2003/0084563 A1).

Ohkubo teaches a method of wire bonding by positioning a workpiece on a moving work table, moving a bond head in a horizontal position and moving the workpiece in a second substantially horizontal direction during bonding wherein the workpieces are supplied from a magazine. The bondhead moves in the x and y directions (figure 3, paragraphs 143-145, 182-184). The camera is conveyed (paragraph 146).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 2, 7-10, 12-17 and 20 are allowed.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Miller (USPN 5931372), Beatson et al. (US 2005/0247758 A1) and Elles et al. (USPN 4361261).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lynne Edmondson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1172. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on (571) 272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lynne Edmondson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1725

ME 6/24/04

LRE